



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

10/10/04

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,340	08/01/2003	Cornelia J. Forster	VPI/02-119 US	3588

27916 7590 10/20/2004

VERTEX PHARMACEUTICALS INC.
130 WAVERLY STREET
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139-4242

EXAMINER

BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/632,340

Applicant(s)

FORSTER ET AL.

Examiner

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

Art Unit

1624

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) ____ is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/11/2004

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-23 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 2/11/2004, are made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Method of use claims 15 and 16 are indefinite as they lack effective amount.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 17-23 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating leukemia does not reasonably provide enablement for treatment any or all diseases or conditions including those yet to be linked with the various mode of action embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant claims are drawn to a method of "treating an autoimmune disease, an inflammatory disease, a metabolic disorder, a psychiatric disorder , diabetes, an

angiogenic disorder, tautopathy, a neurological or neurodegenerative disorder, a spatial cord injury, glaucoma, baldness, or a cardiovascular disease" which as recited reads on any or all diseases or conditions for which there is no enabling disclosure. The scope of the claims includes treatment of any or all of diseases or conditions, which are not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds, provided in the specification. The instant compounds are disclosed have GSK-3 kinase phosphorylation inhibitory activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are useful in treating any or all diseases for which applicants provide no competent evidence. Reading specification it appears that instant compound is useful for treating all sorts of diseases including autoimmune diseases, neurodegenerative diseases or disorders, all inflammatory diseases, all metabolic disorders, all psychiatric disorders, all cardiovascular diseases, etc. for which applicants have not provided any experimental support or nexus. Prior art searches do not lend support to, except for treating leukemia treatments of all diseases embraced in the claim language. That a single class of compounds can treat all or any disease /disorder is an incredible finding for which applicants have not provided enabling disclosure and prior art search at the time of instant invention suggest the use of these inhibitors is still under experimental stage and speculative in nature. Furthermore, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host. Moreover many if not most of diseases such as Alzheimer's disease, multiple sclerosis, ALS, bipolar disorder etc. are very difficult to treat and at present there is no known drug, which can successfully

lessen the course of these diseases, despite the fact that there are many drugs, which can be used for "inflammatory condition".

Inflammation itself is a complex process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There is no common mechanism by which all, or even most, inflammations arise. Mediators include bradykinin, serotonin, C3a, C5a, histamine, leukotrienes, cytokines, and many, many others. Accordingly, treatments for inflammation are normally tailored to the particular type of inflammation present, as there is no, and there can be no "magic bullet" against inflammation generally.

The "autoimmune diseases" are a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There are hundreds such diseases, which have fundamentally different mechanisms and different underlying causes. Thus, the scope of claims is extremely broad.

No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of pathology of diseases and disorders.

Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907, 909; In

re Langer 183 USPQ 288. Also note Hoffman v. Klaus 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and Ex parte Powers 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Interim Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 64 FR 71427 and 71440 (December 21, 1999) wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See Duhe et al. *Cell Biochem. Biophys.* 34(1): 17-59, 2001, Rane et al., *Oncogene* 19(49): 5662-79, 2000, and Kim et al., *Curr. Opin Genet Dev.* 10(5): 508-514, 2000 (PubMed Abstracts provided)

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

- 1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic uses of the compounds in treating several diseases of that require GSK-3 kinase inhibitory activity.
- 2) The state of the prior art: Recent publications at the time of instant invention suggest that GSK-3 kinase as therapeutic agents is still in experimental stage. See references cited above.
- 3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical

use for the therapeutic effect of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show therapeutic effect and the state of the art is that the effects GSK-3 kinase inhibitors are still in experimental stage

6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace treatment of several diseases including those yet to be related to GSK-3 kinase activity.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-23 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,696,452. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claims is an obvious variant of the subject matter taught in the claims of US 6,696,452. Note when R^x is hydrogen, R² and R² form a benzo ring or pyridine ring with C-ring as substituted

phenyl and R^y an optionally substituted aliphatic group, the compounds, composition and the method of use with same mode of action taught by US 6,696,452 overlap with the instant claims 1-15. Note the complex composition claim 14 is also included in this rejection as it is obvious based on the teachings of US 6,696,452.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-0674. If Applicants are unable to reach Mukund Shah within 24-hour period, they may contact James O. Wilson, Acting-SPE of art unit 1624 at 571-272-0661.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Venkataraman Balasubramanian
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

10/14/2004